

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/081,401	Applicant(s) FLYNN, KELLY DALY	
	Examiner Gwendolyn A. Blackwell-Rudasill	Art Unit 1775	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gwendolyn A. Blackwell-Rudasill.

(3) David Strand.

(2) Anthony Serventi.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 March 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-19.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 6,108,295.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Counsel contends that the US '295 does not teach or suggest using indium (In) as part of a phase change alloy in the critical amount as exemplified by Applicant. Counsel also contends that the device as disclosed in US '295 is not a multi level recording device. It was demonstrated that the amount of In in the phase change layer as disclosed in US '295 falls within the parameters as claimed by Applicant. A follow-up to this interview will occur after further examination of arguments..